



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/837,686	04/18/2001	David Boll	10006470-1	7844

7590 07/08/2003

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

FAROOQ, MOHAMMAD O

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2182

DATE MAILED: 07/08/2003

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

TD

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/837,686

Applicant(s)

BOLL, DAVID

Examiner

Mohammad O. Farooq

Art Unit

2182

DP

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 January 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

1. Claims 1-5, 15, 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being unpatentable by Davis et al., U.S. Pat. No. 6,167,462.

2. As to claim 1, Davis et al. teach apparatus for transferring commands, comprising:

a scanner (item 114, fig. 1) including a first port and a second port (see fig. 1) coupled together through a communications bus (item 104, fig. 1); and

control logic (processing element; item 102, fig. 1) associated with the communication bus, the control logic configured to control the passage of data over the communication bus (communicates to other elements of the computer system over the system bus; col. 2, lines 26-31).

3. As to claim 2, Davis et al. teach apparatus comprising a keyboard coupled to the first port (item 106, fig. 1).

Art Unit: 2182

4. As to claim 3, Davis et al. teach apparatus comprising a computer coupled to the second port (see fig. 1 and fig. 5), where the communication bus passes commands from the keyboard directly to the computer.

5. As to claim 4, Davis et al. teach apparatus where control logic (processing element; item 102, fig. 1) is configured to detect the presence of commands from the keyboard (i.e. other elements; col. 2, lines 26-31).

6. As to claim 5, Davis et al. teach apparatus where control logic (processing element) routes commands from the keyboard to the computer (col. 2, lines 26-31).

7. Method claims 15, 18 and 19 have similar limitations as apparatus claims 1, 3, 4 and 5. Davis et al. teach apparatus as set forth in claims 1, 3, 4 and 5. Therefore, Davis et al. also teach method as set forth in claims 15, 18 and 19.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 6-14, 16, 17 and 20-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis et al. U.S. Pat. No. 6,167,462.

Art Unit: 2182

9. As to claims 6-9 and 12, Davis et al. do not teach keyboard enable logic associated with control logic, power supply logic and keyboard commands correspond to a facsimile address. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to incorporate keyboard enable logic associated with control logic, power supply logic and keyboard commands correspond to a facsimile address to the teachings of Davis et al. because that would provide a user to place a document into the scanner, and select scan from the client software to cause the scanner to scan the document and return the scanned image to the client computer (col. 1, lines 50-54).

10. As to claim 10, Davis et al. teach apparatus, wherein keyboard/scanner interface is configured to receive keyboard commands from the control logic and forward the keyboard commands to a processor of the scanner (col. 2, lines 26-31; fig. 1, fig. 5).

11. As to claim 11, Davis et al. teach keyboard commands correspond to an email address (since scanner is used in a network to transfer documents; see fig. 5 and fig. 6).

12. As to claim 13, Davis et al. teach a network interface module coupled (item 122, fig. 1) to the keyboard/scanner interface, the network interface module configured to connect the scanner to an external network (see fig. 1, fig. 5 and fig. 6).

Art Unit: 2182

13. As to claim 14, Davis et al. teach document scanned by the scanner is electronically mailed over the external network (see fig. 5 and fig. 6; col. 3, lines 32-41).

14. Method claims 16, 17 and 20-25 have similar limitations as apparatus claims 7-


14. Davis et al. teach apparatus as set forth in claims 7-14. Therefore, Davis et al. also teach method as set forth in claims 16, 17 and 20-25.

Art Unit: 2182

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mohammad O. Farooq whose telephone number is (703) 305-3888. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey A. Gaffin can be reached on (703) 308-3301. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 746-7239 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.


JEFFREY GAFFIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Mohammad O. Farooq
June 28, 2003